



Appendix B

Recovery Assessment Data

UNOP District Thematic Assessment Questionnaire

Housing Conditions

- What was Katrina's impact upon the housing stock?
- To what extent has the population returned?
- What is the observed level of renovation activity?
- Are there any "intent to return" data from previously conducted surveys?
- Prior to Katrina, was the Neighborhood experiencing reinvestment activity?

Historic Preservation Issues

- What is the level of demolition activity within Historic Districts?
- What were the pressures upon historic Districts prior to Katrina?
- What was Katrina's impact upon historic areas?
- Is proposed development sympathetic to aesthetic characteristics of historic Districts?

Economic Development and Business Activity

- What was Katrina's impact upon major employers?
- What was Katrina's impact upon commercial nodes within the District?
- What is the present condition of major employers in the District? Key commercial nodes?
- Are commercial services (drug stores, grocery stores) readily available?
- Has there been major development activity or development interest in the District?

Transportation and Transit Conditions

- To what extent has transit service been restored to the District? Is it widely utilized?
- What is the condition of major thoroughfares?
- What is condition of ancillary transportation infrastructure -- street signs, traffic signals?
- What is the current status of the pedestrian realm?
- Are alternate (i.e. non-automobile) forms of transportation readily available?

Infrastructure, Public Works, and Debris Removal

- Have all essential City services (trash pick up, water, sewer, power, etc.) been restored?
- What is the quality of City services in the District, such as water pressure and brown outs?
- Is there still visible debris in the District? How effective and reliable is garbage pick up?

Flood Protection

- How much flooding did the District experience from Katrina?
- Which areas or Neighborhoods were particularly hard hit?
- Has the area experienced subsidence through the years?
- How well suited is the architectural stock to withstand flooding?

Public Safety

- Have key public safety facilities, such as police stations and fire stations been restored to the area?
- Was the District plagued by crime before Katrina?
- Has crime—and violent crime in particular—returned since Katrina?

Education and Health Care Facilities

- Have schools and health care facilities re-opened since Katrina?
- What is the present condition of these facilities? What was their condition prior to Katrina?
- Are educational and health facilities conveniently located for those without automobile?

Community Facilities

- Have other community facilities, such as libraries and community centers, been re-opened?
- What is the status of the District's "green infrastructure" such as parks, street tree canopy?
- Were parks and community facilities conveniently located and abundant prior to Katrina?
- What was their pre-Katrina condition?

Detailed Assessment of Individual Neighborhood Planning Efforts Using a "Gap" Analysis

The methodology for the Neighborhood Gap Analysis of the Lambert Plans and other "self-generated" neighborhood plans was to utilize the COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION GAP ANALYSIS QUESTIONNAIRE located in the Unified New Orleans Plan (UNOP) District Recovery Assessment and Planning Guide. The questionnaire was handed out at the first sector steering committee meetings. The questionnaire was used as a vehicle for discussion concerning the general effectiveness and specific details of previous planning efforts with an emphasis on the most recent Lambert Plans for the "wet" neighborhoods. Meeting notes were recorded, edited and then written as a narrative for the following assessment.

SECTOR A: Dixon, Hollygrove, Leonidas, East Carrollton, Marlyville / Fontainebleau, Uptown Triangle / Black Pearl

Representatives from each of the neighborhoods discussed the Lambert planning effort effectiveness. However, most conversations were not neighborhood-specific, but were sector or district-focused. In attendance were representatives from each neighborhood though there were fewer participants from the Hollygrove and Dixon neighborhoods.

The Lambert Plan only addressed flooded areas of this sector including Dixon, Hollygrove, Leonidas and Marlyville / Fontainebleau. Representatives from Hollygrove felt that their concerns were not fully addressed within the Lambert Plans. Steering Committee members from Central Carrollton were not part of the (Lambert) process and recognize the importance of being included in the redevelopment of major infrastructure and city-wide problems.

In general, the Steering Committee for this sector agreed that the Lambert Plan was successful

in addressing some immediate recovery needs but lacked specific attention to each neighborhood, making general assumptions that are not necessarily appropriate or desired. The Lambert Plan did not address all of their concerns including redefining the intersection of Claiborne and Carrollton and the redevelopment of the Carrollton Corridor especially between Claiborne and I-10, where many businesses were impacted. The Lambert Plan was considered very weak in its accuracies regarding the education system (what schools were open vs. what schools were closed). They feel that the plan was insufficient in identifying opportune areas for park development. They would have liked to see zoning, traffic and bus route issues addressed better. A few committee members voiced a dislike of proposed bike routes in unwanted locations such as the neutral ground which is not large enough, and felt that streets and sidewalks take precedent over bike paths.

Steering Committee members applauded the plan for addressing Palmer Park, visualizing a pedestrian overpass at Claiborne, recognizing the need to change traffic patterns and, although there are some problems with the scheme, redeveloping the Carrollton Shopping Center.

Regarding notification about the Lambert Plans, the Steering Committee felt that the process was indirect. They did not receive personal phone calls and their awareness of the planning process was limited to the announcements made by the media (i.e., television and newspaper).

The Steering Committee asked how information already gathered can be incorporated into the Lambert Plan and/or in the Regional Plan. Team facilitators requested a copy or access to a copy of the Lambert Plan to integrate into current planning products.

SECTOR B: Marlyville / Fontainebleau, Broadmoor, Freret, Audubon / University, Uptown

There have been four (4) neighborhood Recovery/Rebuilding Plans prepared in this sector: three by Billes Architects for the Lambert team (Marlyville / Fontainebleau, Audubon / University and Freret), and one by the Broadmoor Improvement Association as a self-generated neighborhood recovery plan. Nearly all of entire sector was covered by one of these plans. The exceptions are five (5) residential blocks along Danneel downriver of Jefferson and Isidore Newman School, which were not included in the Freret or Audubon / University plans. However, this area is within the boundaries of the Neighbors United neighborhood organization, representing the Freret area.

Representatives from each of the neighborhoods reported to the group in turn regarding the plans in their areas. There were several individuals from each neighborhood as well as a representative from Tulane University and an administrator from the former Baptist Hospital. There was also a Loyola administrator who spoke unofficially.

Marlyville / Fontainebleau

This area is included in the boundaries of the Claiborne-University Neighborhood Association (CUNA). Generally, the residents here were pleased with the results of the plan, though there were a few things they might have tweaked and a few gaps. These items were detailed in a written memorandum that was given to the planning team. Items which deserved further emphasis in the recovery plan included traffic calming/neighborhood gateway, blighted housing, power lines, Calhoun commercial corridor, student housing, historic districts and the “University Village” planning effort with Tulane students and Calhoun businesses. The prior planning effort had good participation and the neighborhood association

adopted the Billes Plan as the foundation of a recovery plan. Absent from the planning process, however, were representatives of schools, institutions, businesses and the elderly.

A representative from Audubon Boulevard said their group’s number-one concern was the lack of adequate drainage in the neighborhood, and this point was properly prioritized in the plan. The neighborhood felt that there were no significant gaps in the plan, but they have concerns about how the plan would be implemented, particularly in terms of the proposed pedestrian bridge across Claiborne and the condition of student housing in the area.

Freret

This plan encompasses the area represented by Neighbors United. This group was relatively pleased with Billes’ work, especially given the short time-frame for completion. The residents felt that the planners listened well. Drawbacks included the section on zoning, which was not thoroughly discussed in advance with the neighborhood, the dog park idea for Claiborne, which residents thought was unrealistic, and the lack of details in some areas. Overall, the plan received the neighborhood’s endorsement.

Audubon / University

A representative from the Upper Rickerville Neighborhood Association said they also endorsed the Recovery Plan and their concerns were centered on drainage and the incomplete SELA work. They felt the Recovery Plan needed to emphasize connecting the smaller feeder streets to the work that has been completed on the larger thoroughfares. A representative of Palmer-Calhoun indicated that the FEMA damage assessment map understated the extent of the damage sustained on Palmer Avenue.

Broadmoor

Representatives of the Broadmoor Improvement Association are very enthusiastic about their Recovery Plan, which was an extensive grassroots effort that began just shortly after the storm. The plan did not include a project sheet with estimated costs for the work described in the report, but members of the association were working on these items.

Uptown

There have been two neighborhood rebuilding/recovery plans prepared for areas within this sector (Audubon / University and Freret), both by Billes Architects for the Lambert Team. Over half of the area covered in the sector was not included in these studies. The Recovery, Vision and Goals from each of these plans were visited in order to incorporate pertinent information into the current discussion. The neighborhood scenarios were also reviewed as a starting point for the discussion. Both plans had the same rebuilding scenarios addressing flood protection, streets/sidewalks, public transportation and education.

Claiborne - University Neighborhood Association

The Claiborne - University Neighborhood Association (CUNA) commented that coordination with city-wide and regional planning needs to be incorporated in the planning process. Coordination with adjacent districts and neighborhoods could have been more thorough and could possibly warrant additional planning meetings.

CUNA suggested that the Lambert funding matrix could have been more advanced with some verification of the estimates, reference standards and how quantities were estimated. There was interest in more detail surrounding certain scenarios, for example, for the University Village and the Calhoun business area across from Tulane the following items:

- Pedestrian bridge from Tulane campus
- Street car at Claiborne, closing the loop of the Carrollton Street car line.
- Various urban planning elements – outdoor spaces, landscaping, water feature
- Identification of preservation quality buildings
- Streetscape elements such as awnings, light fixtures, receptacles, seating
- Enhanced circulation both pedestrian and vehicular

Further study is required into the boundaries between districts or neighborhoods. For example, CUNA, Broadmoor, Gert Town all have ideas for the intersection of Earhart and S. Jefferson Davis and Blue Plate. Traffic situation on Vendome to Nashville Ave could be looked at as a scenario.

CUNA felt that advertisement for the planning meetings was somewhat limited, but people who wanted to be there did make it their business to find out. Absent from the process were students, representatives of schools, representatives of institutions, businesses and elderly.

CUNA was very active in the planning process, going to neighborhood meetings for Marlyville / Fontainebleau and Audubon / University. CUNA did not make a formal endorsement of the plan but they adopted it and consider it a foundation for a recovery plan. Broadmoor was not involved with the Lambert planning process or the CUNA planning process. There were times when the Broadmoor plans would have been useful as part of the process, such as at a charrette.